UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/580,695	08/10/2006	Keiko Matsumoto	F-9061	5432
	7590 12/22/201 HAMBURG LLP	EXAMINER		
122 EAST 42ND STREET SUITE 4000			WILLIAMS, STEPHANIE ELAINE	
NEW YORK, NY 10168			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3754	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/22/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/580,695	MATSUMOTO ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	STEPHANIE E. WILLIAMS	3754		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	ely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Au This action is FINAL. Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the off Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the off the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	epted or b) \square objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/25/2006.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite		

Art Unit: 3754

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2. 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, requires the specification to be written in "full, clear, concise, and exact terms." The specification is replete with terms which are not clear, concise and exact. The specification should be revised carefully in order to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Examples of some unclear, inexact or verbose terms used in the specification are: Pg. 5, line 8, "step 7", should be "stem 7"; pg. 7, line 6, "nozzle body 7", should be "nozzle body 12"; Pg.6, line 5, "lower receiving blades 32", should be "lower receiving blades 31".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

Art Unit: 3754

applicant regards as the invention. In line 12, "a coil" has confusing antecedent basis in line 9 with "a coil" it is unclear if second recitation is a double inclusion from line 9.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 6. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ouyang et al. (7,195,134).
- 7. The Ouyang et al. reference discloses a subdivided fixed amount distributing apparatus having an outer sleeve (2) configured to so as to be securable to a top of the aerosol container (20), a stem (22) with a borehole; a nozzle body (see fig.1); a coil spring (143), a fixed amount injection valve (inside valve stem); a push body (144); an upper sleeve (146) having a lower end secured to the outer sleeve; lower receiving blades (148); a flat portion (flat surface of blades; see fig 2); a fitting piece (shorter downward protrusions of 144; see fig.2); upper receiving blades (151); a pushing projection (longer downward protrusions of 144; see fig.2) at an upper surface of the pushing body to be in pressurized contact with a user; and wherein the pushing projection (longer downward protrusions of 144; see fig.2) of the pushing body (144) is formed in coupling with the fitting piece (shorter downward protrusions of 144; see fig.2).

Art Unit: 3754

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 9. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ouyang et al. (7,195,134).
- 10. Having the push body with pushing projection and the fitting piece formed separately is a design choice based upon the needs of the consumer that will be operating the apparatus. Whether the pushing projection and the fitting piece are formed separately or coupled together does not affect the utility of the apparatus. Thus having the push body with pushing projection and the fitting piece formed separately fails to be patentably define over the prior art.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The Lu et al. (2006/0060192; 7,543,582), Lee et al. (2005/0011515), Eckert (7,156,258), Blacker et al. (6,435,372; 6,161,724; 7,575,130), Wass et al. (5,349,945) are other types of subdivided fixed amount distributing apparatuses.

Art Unit: 3754

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to STEPHANIE E. WILLIAMS whose telephone number is (571)272-8059. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached on 571-272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kenneth Bomberg/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3754

/S. E. W./ Examiner, Art Unit 3754